Single Bench

BEFORE THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W.P. No. 3709 Of 2004.

PETITIONER :- Satish Kumar Jaiswal, son of Late G.L. Jaiswal, aged about 65 years, Occupation Advocate and Oath Commissioner, resident of at and P.O. Sakti, Tahsil Sakti, District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)

V E R S U S

RESPONDENTS :-

1. K.A. Ansari, Advocate, in High Court Of Chhattisgarh at Bilaspur, resident of B-1, Priyadarshini Nagar, Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh),
2. The secretary, S.A.R. Public School at village Rishabhtirth, Post Office Barpalikala, Tahsil Sakti, District Janjgir-Champa (Chhattisgarh),

P.R. No. 3709/04 Presented by Shri M.R. Agrawal dated 25/11/04

PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

DETAILS OF PETITION :-

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक W.P.No. 3709/04 **सन्** 200

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अंतिम आदेश

10-01-2005

Shri Pankaj Agrawal, counsel for the petitioner.

Heard on admission.

The petitioner, who is a Senior Practising Advocate at Sakti has filed the instant petition.

The case of the petitioner is that as per the authorization of his client, Shri R.L.Patel, Secretary of M.L.Jain Higher Secondary School, Sakti has served the respondent No. 2 and one Surendra Singh Rajput with a legal notice of Annexure P-1, which was replied to by respondent No. 1 according to the authorization of respondent No. 2 vide reply dated 29-09-2004 as per Annexure P-2.

Grievance of the petitioner is that by the said reply the respondents did not simply contradict the facts described in Annexure P-1 but levelled some baseless allegations against the petitioner and his client and therefore, the present petition has been filed for quashing that part of the reply to the notice, Annexure P-2 which according to the petitioner is defamatory and contemptuous.

After hearing counsel for the petitioner and perusing the documents referred to by the petitioner I am of the view that the present petition is not maintainable as the petitioner has an alternative remedy of approaching the proper forum for redressal of his grievances, if any.

As a result, the petition is dismissed.

Sd/-
Dhirendra Mishra
Judge

GRPRJ—FS/78 —9/2000—50,000.